

## THE CASE OF JUDGE WATROUS

WASHINGTON, Friday, Dec. 10, 1858.

It is alleged in the memorial of Spencer that Judge Watrous *secretly* engaged in this speculation, intending and designing to sit on the trial of the causes which would arise. In proof of this it is stated that Judge Watrous was the first to suggest the propriety of introducing a citizen of another State into this speculation, so that the jurisdiction of his Court might become available. The legal title was vested in that citizen alone, who had no interest in the property than that of a Leauge. Judge Watrous was the first to suggest that the Leauge should concede the interest of Judge Watrous in the property, and that deed has been recorded to that effect. A note was given jointly by Leauge and Watrous for their part of the consideration money, and it had been settled by the Texas Courts, and Judge Watrous knew it. Spencer and the others were mere squatters upon the land, without right or title; and this point has been so decided by the highest Courts in the country—by the Circuit Court at New-Orleans, and by the Supreme Court at Washington.

Will it be contended, asked Mr. Tappen, that a Judge in the State of Texas, or in any other State, can purchase his neighbor's farm, the title to which he has good reason to believe is perfect, because he happens to know that some persons have wrongfully entered upon it, and litigation may become necessary in order to remove them? And yet Judge Watrous has done nothing more than

related to state aloof from the purchase for any such reason as this, under penalty of an impeachment? And yet that is all there is in this case. The title to the land was really beyond question. It had been settled by the Texas Courts, and Judge Watrous knew it. Spencer and the others were more squatters upon the land, without right to it; and the title was finally decided by the highest Courts of the country—by the Circuit Court at New-Orleans, and by the Supreme Court at Washington.

Will it be contended, asked Mr. Tappan, that a Judge in the State of Texas, or in any other State, cannot purchase his neighbor's farm, the title to which he has good reason to believe is perfect, because he happens to know that some persons have wrongfully entered upon it, and litigation may become necessary in order to remove them? And yet Judge Watrous has done nothing more than

How, then, does it appear that Judge Watrous allowed the Court to be used improperly to advance his own interest, or that anything was done that was not proper and lawful? And how does the case stand at this point upon the testimony? It is the purchase of a part interest in a tract of land by Judge Watrous, in connection with gentlemen of the State of Alabama, of the very highest respectability, and Mr. League of Texas, of equal respectability and standing. The contract is offered to the Alabama gentlemen on account of their ability to furnish the necessary funds. The contract is fair and *bona fide*, and Mr. Lapsley states that he and his associates would have gone into no other. There was no concealment even spoken of in the case, and there was no need of any. It was executed in a public room, Mr. Editor, Sir, Lapsley's clerk, and witnessed by Mr. William S. Lapsley, made a subject of conversation with the clerks, marshals, and in Galveston, at the time of the issuance of the writs. It was talked of by Judge Watrous during the Summer of 1850, to his friend, Major Holman, in New-York and Philadelphia. Where, then, is the evidence of concealment or unfairness in this transaction? The testimony does not show it. Will you visit with the terrors of an impeachment, a Judge for exercising the right common to every citizen, the right to purchase land?

It comes at last to this, for the testimony dis-

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**—A statement from the Register of the *Treasury*, of expenditures in the District of Columbia, laid before the Senate by the Vice-President, gives the items of expenditure in detail up to the close of the present fiscal year at \$2,715,552 16. The number of lots originally held by Government was 10,118; the number sold by the Government was 1,000; the number unsold was 9,118; the value in Government, 118; assessed value, \$6,903 30; number given to the Georgetown and Columbia Colleges and St. Vincent's Washington City Orphan Asylum, 783; assessed value, \$70,000. The assessed value of individual property, personal and real, is \$4,730,434. The assessed value of Government reservations outside of the reservation formed by the intersections of streets and avenues, \$1,312,293 36. The cost of public buildings, including furniture, statuary and paintings, is \$14,709,338 00.

mense Blockley Almshouse, perched on the bank of the Schuylkill, in what is now West Philadelphia. When built, some years ago, it was certainly far away in what was then called the country. Now, it is encircled upon by fashionable cemeteries, livery stables, omnibuses and passenger railroads, and the many mansions of the rich have become so large, and the buildings so small, that hundreds were sometime housed and fed, and are now thousands. So, the huge pile must come down and be rebuilt, for the third time, clearly among the rural districts, on a farm, where the paupers may raise their own grain, and if need be, grind it into flour on the tread-mill. Councils have appointed a Committee to inquire into the propriety of removing the establishment into the country. They hope to save money by being thus enabled to maintain their 3,000 paupers at a cheaper rate than where at present located.

It is said the Pennsylvania Railroad Company are giving a thorough and impartial examination to coal-burning engines, with their tubes and fire-boxes invented by Fitch, by an American, and Dimpfel, a Frenchman. Anthracite has been found to be a much cheaper fuel than wood, for steamers and locomotives; but it is ruinously destructive to the grate bars. To prevent their rapid destruction is the great study of inventors, as

An effort is just been made in Indiana to smother the existing facilities. Hitherto any one, wherever residing, could avail himself or herself of the telegraphic process provided by that State. A bill has just passed the Senate requiring a year's residence in the State and a six months' residence in the county where the application is filed, before the petition can be entertained; and also providing that "a abandonment" shall not be deemed established unless it shall have extended through a period of one whole year! This renders the term of "residence" and the period of "a abandonment" identical.

[Albany Journal, 13th.